REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 8-11, 13, 18-21, 28 and 61-63 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aras in view of Jouppi, further in view of Onishi and further in view of Ben-Shachar. The claims recite a second remote station that has control of a robot, and then sending a call back message to a first remote station when the second remote station no longer has access and control of the robot. The Examiner states that Ben-Shachar discloses the recited call back mechanism. The Applicant respectfully traverses this contention.

The Examiner points to paragraph [0107] and cites the following passage:

> "Once a reservation has been revoked, the worker now has room for at least one more client. This available slot is given to a new client that requested a worker. Such a revocation causes a call back notification to be sent to the client's service proxy."

(This passage is ambiguous as to which client is receiving the call back mechanism. This ambiguity is clarified in paragraphs [0110] and [0111], which states that the call back mechanism is sent to the client who is being revoked.) Paragraph [0010] refers to Figure 15 as an example of a call back interface. It is clear from Figure 15 that the call back is informing the present user that their reservation is being revoked. ("oneway void reservation Timed Out"). Thus, Ben-Shachar is providing a notification to the present user that their access is being revoked. This is to be distinguished from the present invention which recites sending a call back message to a first remote station when a second remote station no longer has access and control of the robot. Ben-Shachar sends a notification message to the second remote station, not the first remote station as claimed. The references cited by the Examiner do not disclose or suggest a call back message that is sent to a first remote station when a second remote station no longer has access and control of the robot. The Applicant submits that claims 1, 3, 6, 8-11, 13, 18-21, 28 and 61-63 are patentably distinct from the combination of Aras, Jouppi, Onishi and Ben Shachar.

The Examiners rejected claims 7, 17 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aras, Jouppi, Onishi, Ben-Shachar, Zenke and Roy. The Applicant submits that these claims are allowable for being dependent upon allowable independent claims.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of rejections is requested. Allowance of claims 1, 3, 6-11, 13, 17-21, 27, 28 and 61-63 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

IRELL & MANELLA LLP

Dated: January 6, 2010

Ben Yorks, Reg. No. 33,609

840 Newport Center Drive, Suite 400
Newport Beach, CA 92660
949-760-0991

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: MS AF, Commissioner for Patents, Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on January 6, 2010.

Susan Langworthy Date Jan 6, 2010